

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,163
Docket No.: 10659-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Currently pending claims 1-14 are rejected. Specifically, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (U. S. Pub. 2002/0005696; hereinafter Yamazaki). Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to improve clarity without changing the scope. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-14 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

1. In response to "*Response to Arguments*" stated by the Office Action (page 6), Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 7 to improve clarity but without changing the scope.

2. According to the drawing and the problem to be solved by the present invention, the term "center" is clear. However, the Office Action intends to interpret "center" as "*not the end*". Applicants then amend "center" to "substantially middle position". The amendment does not change the scope, and does not raise new issue.

3. Further, with respect to point 20 of the Office Action, the conductive medium 704 in Fig.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,163
Docket No.: 10659-US-PA

7 is a different piece from the terminals 702. It is believed that independent claim 7 has clearly recited this relation by “...coupled through a conductive medium...”. This clearly indicates that the conductive medium 704 is different from the terminals 702. Claim 13 further defines the conductive medium 704 is a conductive material interface in external connection.

4. The Office Action has referred to FIG. 5 and considered the lower power lined $V_{b1} - V_{bn}$ as a portion of the power line sets. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The problem of voltage drop as discussed by the present invention does not occur on the ground voltage or a low voltage, as provided by the switch 116. For example, if the switch 116 is set to the ground voltage, then there are no voltage drop occurred. This can be understood that the ground voltage from the switch 116 is not the driving power as recited in claims 1-14.

And, that's why the power is called $V_1 - V_n$ and $V_{b1} - V_{bn}$. The low voltage does not flow into the pixel cells, then the pixel cells do not consume the power.

As discussed in previous Response, the power having the issue of voltage drop is the V_{dd} but not the V_{cc} . V_{cc} is usually a ground voltage or a low voltage.

Applicants also respectfully reminds that “hindsight” and “improperly construing the prior art” should be carefully avoided.

5. Even further, although Applicants disagree, Applicants try to take the lower power line sets $V_{b1} - V_{bn}$ as a portion of the power line sets, as considered by the Office Action. In this situation, the switch 116 is connected to the end of the lower power line set $V_{b1} - V_{bn}$ (the line

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,163
Docket No.: 10659-US-PA

Vb3 in Fig. 5). This "Vb3" is certainly not the center the corresponding power line set.

Again, Applicants have to state that the issue of voltage drop does not occur on ground voltage or a low voltage. However, if the switch 116 provides the high voltage, then the voltage drop phenomenon in this connection occurs, in which the voltage on line Vb1 is then less than the voltage on line Vb3.

Alternatively, if the switch 116 provides the ground voltage, then all lines Vb1 - Vbn are at the same voltage. The voltage drop phenomenon does not occur, and this provides further evidences being different from the present invention.

6. Particularly to the features recited in independent claim 1 and 7 that "an electric current resulting from a voltage applied to each power line set passes through the secondary power lines into a plurality of corresponding pixels in the organic light-emitting display".

However, in FIG. 5 and FIG. 6 disclosed by Yamazaki, when the power line V1 is conducted and applied with voltage, and the switch 116 is used to control on/off of the transistor 1702 (FIG. 6), the current direction is first flowing through the line V1, then through the transistor 1702 and the pixel, and then to the line Vb1. This does not equally disclose the claimed features of the present invention. Even if the Vb1 is conducted to the line V1, then the current from the line V1 is directly flowing to the switch 116 and to the ground, without flowing to the pixel. Therefore, the line Vb1 is not the secondary power line.

Therefore, Yamazaki does not equally disclose the full features of the present invention.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,163
Docket No.: 10659-US-PA

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 7 patently define over the prior art, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-6 and 8-14 patently define over the prior art as well.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,163
Docket No.: 10659-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-14 of the invention patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

May 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@icipgroup.com.tw
Usa@icipgroup.com.tw